

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFERY JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAUL L. MALONEY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-233

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit against U.S. District Judge Paul L. Maloney, U.S. Magistrate Judge Ray Kent, and the “United States Government.” On March 17, 2025, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that this lawsuit be dismissed upon initial screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) on grounds that the lawsuit is frivolous.<sup>1</sup> The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff’s objections to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 10). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. Plaintiff disagrees that his claims are frivolous (ECF No. 10). However, as the Magistrate Judge properly and thoroughly set forth,

---

<sup>1</sup> The Magistrate Judge further recommended that the Court prohibit Plaintiff from filing a lawsuit in this Court without the prepayment of the filing fee, unless Plaintiff obtains a signature from a licensed attorney admitted to the Western District of Michigan certifying that Plaintiff’s complaint is not frivolous, malicious, or brought for an improper purpose (R&R, ECF No. 9 at PageID.27). This prohibition was adopted on March 26, 2025 in *Jackson v. U.S. Government et al.*, 1:25-cv-196 (Order, ECF No. 8 at PageID.28).

Plaintiff's factual allegations fail to implicate any exceptions to judicial immunity and fail to allege or identify an express waiver of sovereign immunity.

Therefore, the Court denies the Objections and issues this Opinion and Order. Additionally, a Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58. For the above reasons and because this action was filed *in forma pauperis*, this Court also certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this Judgment would not be taken in good faith. *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610–11 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 206, 211–12 (2007). Accordingly:

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Objections (ECF No. 10) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 9) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 8) is DISMISSED pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) for the reasons stated in the Report and Recommendation.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

Dated: May 30, 2025

/s/ Jane M. Beckering  
JANE M. BECKERING  
United States District Judge